



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/032,309	12/21/2001	Flora P. Goldthwaite	MSFT-0741/188840.1	6541

41505 7590 02/10/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)
ONE LIBERTY PLACE - 46TH FLOOR
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, LE V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 02/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/032,309	Applicant(s) GOLDTHWAITE ET AL.	
	Examiner Le Nguyen	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/22/05.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 11/22/05.
2. Claims 1-44 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 17 and 32 are independent claims. Claims 17 and 32 have been amended.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. From applicant's arguments it appears that by "displaying from the user's digital history store on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interests wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith" applicant meant: displaying the timeline with a plurality of unique icons wherein each of the plurality of unique icons are images from the group consisting of people, places and things relating to a time period of interests, so that the relationships between timeline/time period of interest and that of people, places and things are less likely to be interpreted as being indirectly related. Given the original interpretation, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 is

appropriate and given the second interpretation, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is appropriate as disclosed below.

Claim Rejections

6. Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 9-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Moran et al. ("Moran") or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Wolff et al. ("Wolff").

Given the original interpretation that the timeline displayed is *associated* with events, people, places and things and wherein these events, people, places and things are *related* to the time period of interest and have a unique icon associated therewith, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102 is appropriate and given the second interpretation that the timeline is displayed with a plurality of unique icons wherein each of the plurality of unique icons are images from the group consisting of people, places and things relating to a time period of interests, a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is appropriate.

As per claim 1, Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, comprising selecting a time period of interest on the timeline (fig. 17; section [0232]; *selection via indicator 1703*) and displaying from the user's digital history store on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interests, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith (figs. 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0113], [0198], [0201], [0200], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *displaying a timeline*

associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period selected wherein the icon may be in the form of a thumbnail).

In the alternative, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, comprising selecting a time period of interest on the timeline (fig. 17; section [0232]; *selection via indicator 1703*) and displaying from the user's digital history store on the timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period of interests, wherein each event, person, place and thing has a unique icon associated therewith (figs. 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0113], [0198], [0201], [0202], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *displaying a timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period selected wherein the icon may be in the form of a thumbnail*), Moran does not explicitly disclose displaying the timeline with a plurality of unique icons wherein each of the plurality of unique icons are images from the group consisting of people, places and things relating to a time period of interests. Wolff teaches displaying the timeline with a plurality of unique icons wherein each of the plurality of unique icons are images from the group consisting of people, places and things relating to a time period of interests (fig. 1, *element 102*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Wolff with the method of Moran in order to eliminate an additional navigational step and, therefore, save time.

As per claim 2, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including displaying in a navigation region a root navigation region displaying icons for events, people, places

and things (Moran: figs. 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0198], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *root navigation regions such as 1400, 1601 and 1701*) and in response to selecting one of the events, people, places and things icons in the root navigation region, displaying a cluster of one of events, people, places and things corresponding to the selection and relating to the time period of interest (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229]; *upon selection of one of the icons in the root navigation region, the timeline interface is updated to show all event related to the selection*).

As per claim 5, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to selecting one of the elements of the cluster, displaying a sub-cluster of elements of which the cluster is comprised, wherein the sub-cluster of elements relate to the time period of interest (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 6, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein selecting in the navigating region includes displaying in a path display portion a currently navigated path by the user from root region to individual elements, including intervening selected clusters (Moran: section [0186]).

As per claim 9, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes inputting user preference information for pre-specified aspects of said displaying (Moran: sections [0204] and [0229]).

As per claim 10, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to a user selection, displaying additional information about the displayed icons (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 11, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein the time period of interest is selected from one of a range of at least one hour, a range of at least one day, a range of at least one week, a range of at least one month and a range of at least one year (Moran: figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

As per claims 12 and 13, Moran/the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said selecting a time period of interest includes scoping to a time period of interest with a scoping mechanism and wherein the scoping mechanism is a scroll bar (Moran: figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

Claims 14-16 are individually similar in scope to claim 1 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

7. Claims 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-33, 36, 37, 39 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Wolff et al. ("Wolff").

As per claim 17, although Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, the computer executable modules comprising a selecting mechanism for selecting a time period of interest on the timeline (fig. 17;

section [0232]; *selection via indicator 1703*) and a display mechanism that displays events, people, places and things relating to the time period of from the user's digital history store on the timeline store on the timeline (figs. 11, 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0113], [0198], [0201], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *displaying a timeline associated with events, people, places and things relating to the time period selected wherein the icon may be in the form of a thumbnail*), Moran does not explicitly disclose displaying events, people, places and things *directly* relating to a time period of interests. Wolff teaches computer readable medium comprising displaying events, people, places and things directly relating to a time period of interests (fig. 1, *element 102*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the computer readable medium of Wolff with the computer readable medium of Moran in order to eliminate an additional navigational step and, therefore, save time.

As per claim 18, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline including displaying in a navigation region a root navigation region displaying icons for events, people, places and things (Moran: figs. 13, 14, 16 and 17; sections [0198], [2020], [0204], [0047] and [0232]; *root navigation regions such as 1400, 1601 and 1701*) and in response to selecting one of the events, people, places and things icons in the root navigation region, displaying a cluster of one of events, people, places and things corresponding to the selection and relating to the time period of interest (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229];

upon selection of one of the icons in the root navigation region, the timeline interface is updated to show all event related to the selection).

As per claim 21, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline including in response to selecting one of the elements of the cluster, displaying a sub-cluster of elements of which the cluster is comprised, wherein the sub-cluster of elements relate to the time period of interest (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 22, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline wherein selecting in the navigating region includes displaying in a path display portion a currently navigated path by the user from root region to individual elements, including intervening selected clusters (Moran: section [0186]).

As per claim 24, although the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in the timeline (Moran: section [0128]), the modified Moran does not explicitly disclose inputting text to a query input portion. Official Notice is taken that inputting text to a query input portion to extract data is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include inputting

text to a query input portion to extract data to the modified Moran's teaching of providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in order to provide users with an alternative or additional input means.

As per claim 25, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes inputting user preference information for pre-specified aspects of said displaying (Moran: sections [0204] and [0229]).

As per claim 26, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including in response to a user selection, displaying additional information about the displayed icons (Moran: fig. 16; section [0229]).

As per claim 27, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline wherein the time period of interest is selected from one of a range of at least one hour, a range of at least one day, a range of at least one week, a range of at least one month and a range of at least one year (Moran: figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

As per claims 28 and 29, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline wherein said

selecting a time period of interest includes scoping to a time period of interest with a scoping mechanism and wherein the scoping mechanism is a scroll bar (Moran: figs. 11-14 and 16-20).

Claims 30-32 are individually similar in scope to claim 17 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 33 is similar in scope to claim 18 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 36 is similar in scope to claim 21 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 37 is similar in scope to claim 22 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 39 is similar in scope to claim 24 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 40 is similar in scope to claim 25 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 41 is similar in scope to claim 26 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 42 is similar in scope to claim 27 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 43 and 44, in combination, are similar in scope to the combination of claims 28 and 29 and are therefore rejected under similar rationale.

8. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella").

As per claim 3, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship (sections [0202], [0235] and [0243]), Moran does not explicitly disclose the relationship being one of (1) recency of activity associated therewith, (2) frequency of activity associated therewith and (3) user preferences. Sciammarella teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity associated therewith (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Sciammarella's teaching of placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity to Moran's teaching of placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship so that a temporal relationship among the elements would be clearly visible to a viewer.

As per claim 4, the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said placing emphasis includes at least one of changing the size of the icon, changing a contrast associated with the icon and positioning the icon according to a direction of emphasis (Sciammarella: figs. 1-3).

9. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Wolff et al. ("Wolff") as applied to claim 1, and further in view of Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella").

As per claim 3, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship (sections [0202], [0235] and [0243]), Moran does not explicitly disclose the relationship being one of (1) recency of activity associated therewith, (2) frequency of activity associated therewith and (3) user preferences. Sciammarella teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity associated therewith (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Sciammarella's teaching of placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity to Moran's teaching of placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship so that a temporal relationship among the elements would be clearly visible to a viewer.

As per claim 4, the modified Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said placing emphasis includes at least one of changing the size of the icon, changing a contrast associated with the icon and positioning the icon according to a direction of emphasis (Sciammarella: figs. 1-3).

10. Claims 19, 20, 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Wolff et al. ("Wolff") as applied to claims 18 and 33, and further in view of Sciammarella et al. ("Sciammarella").

As per claim 19, although the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship (Moran: sections [0202], [0235] and [0243]), the modified Moran does not explicitly disclose the relationship being one of (1) recency of activity associated therewith, (2) frequency of activity associated therewith and (3) user preferences. Sciammarella teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, wherein said displaying includes placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity associated therewith (Abstract). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Sciammarella's teaching of placing emphasis on elements based upon recency of activity to the modified Moran's teaching of placing emphasis on elements of the cluster based upon a relationship so that a temporal relationship among the elements would be clearly visible to a viewer.

As per claim 20, the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline wherein said placing emphasis includes at least one of changing the size of the icon, changing a contrast associated

with the icon and positioning the icon according to a direction of emphasis

(Sciammarella: figs. 1-3).

Claim 34 is similar in scope to claim 19 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 20 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Fernandes.

As per claim 7, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes a drag-and-drop operation, i.e. dragging an element from one region to another, and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection (figs. 11, 13, 14 and 16-20; section [0047]), Moran does not explicitly disclose dragging an element from the navigation region to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element. Fernandes teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element (fig. 3; col. 12, lines 7-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes' teaching of dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element to Moran's teaching of dragging an element from one region to another and filtering elements

displayed in the timeline according to user selection in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

12. Claims 23 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Moran et al. ("Moran") in view of Wolff et al. ("Wolff") as applied to claims 18 and 33, and further in view of in view of Fernandes.

As per claim 23, although the modified Moran teaches a computer readable medium having stored thereon a plurality of computer-executable modules for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes a drag-and-drop operation, i.e. dragging an element from one region to another, and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection (figs. 11, 13, 14 and 16-20; section [0047]), the modified Moran does not explicitly disclose dragging an element from the navigation region to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element. Fernandes teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline, including dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element (fig. 3; col. 12, lines 7-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fernandes' teaching of dragging an element to a filter region to filter the elements displayed in the timeline according to the dragged element to the modified Moran's teaching of dragging an element from one region to another and filtering elements displayed in the timeline according to user selection in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

Claim 38 is similar in scope to claim 23 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

13. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moran et al. ("Moran").

As per claim 8, although Moran teaches a method for displaying elements from a user's digital history store on a timeline that includes providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in the timeline (section [0128]), Moran does not explicitly disclose inputting text to a query input portion. Official Notice is taken that inputting text to a query input portion to extract data is well known in the art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include inputting text to a query input portion to extract data to Moran's teaching of providing input for querying a database and in response to the input, filtering the elements displayed in order to provide users with an alternative or additional input means.

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 11/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued the following:

Moran's elements of figs. 11-13 clearly do not each have a unique icon.

Moreover, the elements of fig. 14 are not on a timeline.

The examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Elements on the timeline of figs. 11 and 13 are associated with people, places, events and things (fig. 14) such that clicking on these elements allow users to view people, places, events and things (sections [0047], [0141], [0198] and [0232], *meeting/event*; section [0204], figs. 13 and 14, *people such as Betty, Adam, Charlie*; section [0113], fig. 14, *places such as virtual meeting places/chat rooms*; and, section [0201]; fig. 13; *things such as computers 1404 and 1405*) as claimed in claims 1, 17 and 32. Furthermore, the icons are unique to their given category of people, places, events and things.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chiu et al. (US 6,452,615 B1) teach a system and apparatus for notetaking with digital video and ink.

Hatori et al. (US 5,977,974) teach an information processing apparatus and method.

Shiraishi et al. (US 6,661,438 B1) teach a display apparatus and portable information processing apparatus.

Seaman et al. (US 5,414,644) teach a chronological timeline is used to control the order in which the images are displayed, i.e. the images are displayed in sequential order using the time-based number.

Inquires

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, can be reached on (703) 308-0640.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

LVN
Patent Examiner
January 29, 2006

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100